All periodic evaluations of lecturers, librarians, and counselors (temporary faculty) will be conducted during the Spring Semester. Annual evaluations shall cover the preceding calendar year (typically, spring and fall). Cumulative evaluations, required for initial, and renewal, three-year appointments will also be conducted during Spring Semester. All faculty evaluations will be completed in eFaculty. For more information on using eFaculty, please visit What Goes Where? Preparing Materials in eFaculty.

Pursuant to Article 15.12 a. of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), faculty members subject to review “shall be responsible for the identification of materials they wish to be considered, as well as materials required by campus policy, and for the submission of such materials as may be accessible to them.” Failure to submit required documentation or otherwise cooperate in the evaluation process may be taken into consideration in the faculty member’s evaluation.

It is important that faculty receive complete and detailed evaluations, regardless of their reappointment status or the work they performed (i.e., teaching, service, or research). The evaluator’s written comments should support the rating given and should note any changes in the faculty member’s performance since the last evaluation. Evaluations should be based on written evidence, not on informal sources of input such as casual comments.

Which Faculty Must Be Evaluated?

Annual Evaluation

- All full-time (1.0 FTEF) and part-time (less than 1.0 FTEF) temporary faculty who have been appointed for two or more semesters, but not holding a three (3) year appointment, must be evaluated each year.

- All full-time and part-time temporary faculty with three-year appointments must be evaluated at least once during the three-year appointment term. As a best practice, they may be evaluated more frequently. At minimum, an annual evaluation should occur in the second year of the three-year appointment.

Although not required, a temporary faculty member who has been appointed for only one semester or less may be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair or appropriate administrator. However, if a faculty member is hired for Fall Semester 2023, and is appointed in Spring Semester 2024, the faculty member is a two-semester appointee and must be evaluated.

Candidates for Cumulative Evaluation

Consideration for new or renewal three-year appointments (“entitlement”) can only be made after lecturers, temporary librarians, or temporary counselors (not coaches) undergo cumulative evaluation.

- New appointments follow employment during the prior academic year and six consecutive years of prior service in the department, with review occurring in spring of the 6th or subsequent year. The period of review for initial three-year appointments is the entire qualifying period (at least this and the prior 5 years).

- Renewals follow three consecutive years of an appointment, with review occurring in spring of the 3rd or subsequent year. The period of review for renewal is the entire three-year appointment time span. Note: Cumulative Evaluations should be completed even if the faculty member was not appointed during the third (or any other) year of a Three-Year appointment.
Appointments to an initial three-year appointment, and reappointment to a subsequent three-year appointment, are contingent upon findings of annual and cumulative evaluations conducted pursuant to provisions of Article 15 of the CBA. The appropriate administrator must determine that the candidate performed the duties of their position in a satisfactory manner and have no documented serious conduct problems.

**Required Documents**

In periodic evaluations, reviewers are to consider, and make recommendations about, faculty performance in all assigned duties during the period of review. Cumulative evaluations include review of the cumulative work performance over the period of review.

The following are requirements for documenting faculty performance for each review type. Faculty whose appointments include non-teaching duties and maintaining qualifications or credentials shall be evaluated on performance in those areas as well.

### Annual Evaluation - eFaculty Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enter or Upload to This Activities Tab...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Annual Summary of Achievements - Lecturers/Librarians (ASA-L)</td>
<td>Review: Annual/Cumulative Evaluation of Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All SOTEs for prior calendar year; Syllabus for each course taught; other evidence of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Classes Taught at SJSU, SOTE/SOLATEs, Syllabi, etc. and/or Additional Courses and Student Evaluations SOTE/SOLATEs from Spring 2013 to present are preloaded to these sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Direct Observations of Teaching (peer evaluation) from the prior year</td>
<td>Direct Observations of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any other department evaluations or evidence of performance in assignment</td>
<td>Choose tab as appropriate to tab’s description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Evaluation - eFaculty Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enter or Upload to This Activities Tab...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All prior reviews including ASAs and evaluator comments.</td>
<td>Prior Evaluations and Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Faculty undergoing concurrent Annual Evaluation should note the date to upload Department Level Evaluation(s) and any Optional Response to F180, Activities Tab, &quot;Prior Evaluations and Reviews&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All SOTEs from period of review; Syllabus for each course (title) taught; other evidence of teaching effectiveness</td>
<td>Classes Taught at SJSU, SOTE/SOLATEs, Syllabi, etc. and/or Additional Courses and Student Evaluations SOTE/SOLATEs from Spring 2013 to present are preloaded to these sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All Direct Observations of Teaching (peer evaluation) from the period of review</td>
<td>Direct Observations of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Any other department evaluations or evidence of performance in assignment</td>
<td>Choose tab as appropriate to tab description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty may use other Activities tabs in eFaculty to relay achievements. Additional documentation from the period of review may be provided by the faculty member or gathered by the Department and shall be included in the WPAF and considered in the evaluation. Copies of materials not provided by anyone other than the reviewed faculty member must be given to the faculty member at least five (5) days before the review begins. Faculty have the right to rebut the material in the WPAF.

**Evaluation Steps**

**Department Level**

**Annual Evaluations**

- **Part-time lecturers** may be evaluated by their chair alone during annual evaluations at the department level, but some departments use an elected faculty committee.
- **Full-time lecturers** must be evaluated by an elected department committee during annual evaluations.

In annual evaluations, faculty are rated on this scale: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Good, Excellent

**Cumulative Evaluations**

- A **Department committee** of tenured faculty elected by the probationary and tenured faculty conducts the evaluations.
- If the **Department Chair** is not part of the committee, the Chair may submit a separate recommendation as part of the evaluation process.

In cumulative evaluations, faculty are rated as "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory."

Within ten calendar days of the department level evaluation, candidates may submit a response/rebuttal to the department's evaluation(s). After ten days, the WPAF, department level evaluation(s), and any response/rebuttal will be forwarded to the Dean's office via eFaculty. *Note: Annual evaluations for those undergoing concurrent cumulative evaluations shall be uploaded to Faculty180 by faculty so the department committee may use it for cumulative evaluation.* The appropriate administrator will conduct both the annual and cumulative evaluations separately.

**College Level**

All lecturers are evaluated by the appropriate administrator (the dean or designee). At the college level of evaluations, the appropriate administrator reviews all materials in the faculty member's WPAF, department level evaluation(s), and any response/rebuttal to the department level evaluation(s).

In cumulative evaluations, the dean or designee rates the faculty member as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory." Appropriate administrators must review the PAF of each faculty member prior to determining their ratings in the cumulative evaluation. The PAFs will be uploaded to the RPT interface in eFaculty. The reviewer must sign the PAF Log electronically by following a link to the OnBase Log Sheet and submitting their view.

Following the appropriate administrator's determination, the faculty member and department will receive a copy of the college level evaluation. The faculty member has 10 calendar days to respond to and/or rebut the evaluation. Afterward, Faculty Services places the evaluations and responses in the faculty members' PAFs.
Appointments For AY 2024-2025

Chairs' decisions to re-appoint lecturers to annual appointments must be based on the careful consideration of their evaluations and applications. If a temporary faculty employee applies for a subsequent appointment and does not receive one, the faculty member's right to file a grievance is limited to allegations of a failure to give careful consideration. Reviewing the faculty member's PAF may be considered a good faith effort toward careful consideration.

PAFs shall be available for careful consideration review electronically via ShareBase starting April 26 2024. Chairs must review the PAF for any AY faculty member whose timebase will be reduced due to findings from the evaluation process.

No appointment will be approved unless the lecturer's annual evaluation has been received by FS. Lecturers who receive "Unsatisfactory" in an evaluation cannot be re-appointed.

In cumulative evaluations, it is the Appropriate Administrator's responsibility to define what is required to achieve "Satisfactory." Satisfactory ratings must be objective and non-discriminatory; they may include narrative comments including constructive suggestions for development. Ratings of "Unsatisfactory" must include written comments. Faculty rated "unsatisfactory" may not receive another three year appointment.